

## Enumerating asymptomatic COVID-19 cases and estimating SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding rates via wastewater-based epidemiology

Bradley W. Schmitz<sup>a,†</sup>, Gabriel K. Innes<sup>b,†</sup>, Sarah M. Prasek<sup>c</sup>, Walter Q. Betancourt<sup>c</sup>, Erika R. Stark<sup>c</sup>, Aidan R. Foster<sup>c</sup>, Alison G. Abraham<sup>d</sup>, Charles P. Gerba<sup>c</sup>, and Ian L. Pepper<sup>c,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Yuma Center of Excellence for Desert Agriculture (YCEDA), University of Arizona, 6425 W. 8<sup>th</sup> St., Yuma, AZ 85364, USA

<sup>b</sup> Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Rutgers University, 683 Hoes Lane West, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854, USA.

<sup>c</sup> Water & Energy Sustainable Technology (WEST) Center, University of Arizona, 2959 W. Calle Agua Nueva, Tucson, AZ 85745, USA.

<sup>d</sup> Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, 1635 Aurora Ct, Aurora, CO 80045, USA.

† These first authors contributed equally to this article.

\*Corresponding author. Bradley Schmitz. Mailing address: 6425 W. 8<sup>th</sup> St., Yuma, AZ 85364.


Tel: 480-482-0682. Email: [bschmitz@arizona.edu](mailto:bschmitz@arizona.edu)

**Running title:** Enumerating SARS-CoV-2 Fecal Shedding and Asymptomatic Cases via Wastewater

## Highlights

- Wastewater-based epidemiology with clinical testing monitored SARS-CoV-2 in dorms.
- 79.2% of SARS-CoV-2 infections were asymptomatic, and 20.8% were symptomatic.
- Clinical and wastewater data aggregated to estimate SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding rate.
- Mean fecal shedding rate based on the N1 gene was  $6.84 \pm 0.77 \log_{10} \text{ gc/g-feces}$ .
- Mean fecal shedding rate based on the N2 gene was  $7.74 \pm 0.53 \log_{10} \text{ gc/g-feces}$ .

## Graphical Abstract



## 1 **Abstract**

2           Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) was utilized to monitor SARS-CoV-2 RNA in  
3 sewage collected from manholes specific to individual student dormitories (dorms) at the  
4 University of Arizona in the fall semester of 2020, which led to successful identification and  
5 reduction of transmission events. Positive wastewater samples triggered clinical testing of almost  
6 all residents within that dorm; thus, SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals were identified regardless  
7 of symptom expression. This current study examined clinical testing data to determine the  
8 abundance of asymptomatic versus symptomatic cases in these defined communities. Nasal and  
9 nasopharyngeal swab samples processed via antigen and PCR tests indicated that 79.2% of  
10 SARS-CoV-2 infections were asymptomatic, and only 20.8% of positive cases reported COVID-  
11 19 symptoms at the time of testing. Clinical data was paired with corresponding wastewater virus  
12 concentrations, which enabled calculation of viral shedding rates in feces per infected person(s).  
13 Mean shedding rates averaged from positive wastewater samples across all dorms were  $6.84 \pm$   
14  $0.77 \log_{10}$  genome copies per gram of feces (gc/g-feces) based on the N1 gene and  $7.74 \pm 0.53$   
15  $\log_{10}$  gc/g-feces based on the N2 gene. Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding rates from  
16 infected persons has been the critical missing component necessary for WBE models to measure  
17 and predict SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence in communities. The findings from this study can  
18 be utilized to create models that can be used to inform public health prevention and response  
19 actions.

20

21 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, fecal shedding, asymptomatic, SARS-CoV-2 infection, public health  
22 response, wastewater-based epidemiology, COVID-19, dormitories

23

## 24 1. Introduction

25 SARS-CoV-2 infections may not end with current vaccination efforts. Some scientists  
26 conjecture that the virus' evolution may require long-term monitoring and more intensive public  
27 health measures to control transmission of new variants. Thus, additional public health  
28 surveillance strategies can and should be implemented to prevent and respond to outbreaks;  
29 wastewater based epidemiology (WBE) may be one of those tools.

30 Human wastewater (i.e., sewage) may be among the first indications of aggregated,  
31 population-based SARS-CoV-2 infections in a community (Medema et al., 2020b), followed by  
32 healthcare facility reported number of infections, hospitalizations, and ultimately deaths. WBE is  
33 an effective, critical tool that has been demonstrated to monitor concentrations of SARS-CoV-2  
34 RNA in wastewater as an indicator to survey the SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence at a  
35 population level (Medema et al., 2020b). The results from these surveys can be used to track  
36 community infection dynamics (Peccia et al., 2020) and guide targeted public health response  
37 actions (Betancourt et al., 2021). Therefore, fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 may be utilized as a  
38 biomarker to estimate SARS-CoV-2 infections in a population..

39 Shedding estimates of SARS-CoV-2 from infected individuals have strong implications  
40 for the effectiveness of WBE to determine disease prevalence and guide public health  
41 interventions. Although SARS-CoV-2 has been shown to shed in the upper respiratory tract, the  
42 lower respiratory tract, feces, urine and serum (Cevik et al., 2020), WBE leverages RNA  
43 shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in feces. Infected persons shed virus into sewage via feces (Cevik et  
44 al., 2020), or urine (Brönimann et al., 2020), both of which can then be used to monitor  
45 population-level infection changes. Although SARS-CoV-2 has been isolated in urine of a  
46 COVID-19 patient (Sun et al., 2020), the incidence of the virus in urine is reported to be low

47 (Brönimann et al., 2020; Morone et al., 2020); whereas, intact SARS-CoV-2 virus have been  
48 isolated from feces (Wang et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2020; Zhang et al., n.d.). Further, viral RNA  
49 has been recovered even in the absence of intact virus isolation from stool samples (Wölfel et al.,  
50 2020), highlighting the sensitivity of molecular methods applied for WBE.

51 During the early stages of the pandemic in the Netherlands, SARS-CoV-2 was detected in  
52 sewage six days before initial cases were reported (Medema et al., 2020a). Multiple jurisdictions  
53 around the world have monitored concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in sewage samples to  
54 quantify the total number of infected persons in the community that excreted the virus into  
55 wastewater (Ahmed et al., 2020; Chavarria-Miró et al., 2021; Curtis et al., 2020). More recently,  
56 the University of Arizona (UArizona) used WBE, dovetailed with targeted clinical testing, to  
57 prevent COVID-19 outbreaks in student dormitories (dorms). In particular, 91 wastewater  
58 samples containing SARS-CoV-2 RNA provided early-warning that at least one infected  
59 individual was present in the community (Betancourt et al., 2021). The UArizona case study  
60 highlighted the effectiveness of WBE to detect the presence of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals  
61 in a defined community and to ultimately contain outbreaks by triggering public health response  
62 actions. Although WBE has been utilized to raise the alert of SARS-CoV-2 presence with a  
63 dichotomous threshold, quantifying the number of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals cannot be  
64 done without accurate fecal shedding rate estimates.

65 This research aims to estimate SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding rates in infected persons by  
66 aggregating data from positive wastewater samples with numbers of known symptomatic and  
67 asymptomatic individuals in defined communities. To that end, the Campus Re-entry study at the  
68 UArizona in Fall 2020 (Betancourt et al., 2021) provided a unique setting to calculate mean  
69 shedding rates for defined communities. Specifically, 13 dorms served as a case study to test the

70 utility of WBE to monitor SARS-CoV-2 levels in sewage and initiate public health action based  
71 upon those results. Positive SARS-CoV-2 detection in wastewater samples from any given dorm  
72 led to point prevalence antigen and/or PCR testing for the vast majority of dormitory residents  
73 regardless of symptomatic expression; thus, the numbers of symptomatic and asymptomatic  
74 individuals was known. This current study determines the proportion of COVID-19 infections  
75 that were asymptomatic versus symptomatic and pairs these clinical data with wastewater results  
76 to extrapolate the fecal shedding rate of SARS-CoV-2 in infected students. Findings from this  
77 study will inform how WBE can be utilized for public health prevention and response actions.

## 78 **2. Methods**

### 79 *2.1. Dormitory Sites*

80 In total, 13 dorms (Dorm A–M) were monitored throughout the Fall 2020 Semester  
81 (August 17–November 20). Data from the final weeks of classes and exams following the  
82 Thanksgiving break (November 21–December 17) are not included in this analysis, as students  
83 were advised to complete the semester virtually and not return to campus. Each wastewater  
84 sample was collected from sewer manholes specific to each dorm’s effluent prior to convergence  
85 with other sewer pipelines; thus, all wastewater samples were specific to the defined  
86 communities living in each dorm. However, two sets of dorms (Dorm E and F; Dorm H and I)  
87 required sampling from a single sewer manhole distal from the mixing of wastewater from the  
88 two dorms but proximal to convergence with other pipelines. The dorms in each set are located  
89 directly side-by-side and were considered a ‘combined dorm’ for all public health response  
90 actions (i.e., clinical testing interventions) and data analysis. Dorms varied in infrastructure and  
91 resident occupancy (Table 1). Due to the pandemic, UArizona limited dorm room occupancy to a  
92 maximum of two.

## 93 2.2. Wastewater Sampling and Analysis

94 Wastewater samples from each dorm were collected between 9:00 and 10:30 am, then  
95 analyzed for SARS-CoV-2 RNA at least twice per week. One set of dorms was monitored on  
96 Monday/Wednesday/Friday (Dorms A, B, C, D, G, L), while a second set was monitored  
97 Tuesday/Thursday/Saturday (Dorms E-F, H-I, J, K, M). Grab samples were collected inside  
98 sewer manholes with sterile Nalgene® bottles that were affixed to extension poles, which  
99 allowed collection at depths of 5 to 15 feet. Velocity (ft<sup>3</sup>/s) of wastewater within the sewer was  
100 measured using a Global Water FP 211 flow probe (Global Water, College Station, TX).  
101 Multiple readings of the minimum and maximum flow rates (gallons per minute) over a one-  
102 minute period were averaged and recorded. Flow rates were calculated using Manning's equation  
103 for partially full pipes (Akgiray, 2005). For all wastewater samples, the wastewater's height and  
104 depth was estimated to be approximately two inches, based upon the height of the fluid on the  
105 propellor sensor. Note, this assumption was necessary since exact measurements were not  
106 possible inside sewer manholes. The depth of the wastewater was never above the propellor  
107 sensor and a velocity reading could not be recorded if wastewater height was not near the top of  
108 the propellor (2-inch height) but was nonetheless considered reasonable. Statistical methods were  
109 used to estimate flow rates for samples for which velocity could not be measured due to site  
110 obstruction or the flow probe not being available (See Section 2.6).

111 Grab samples collected at the same time of each sampling day were considered adequate  
112 based on a prior multiple sampling event. In that case, multiple samples were collected at a  
113 particular site over a 30-minute period, and analysis indicated virtually identical virus  
114 concentrations (Betancourt et al., 2021). This suggest that virus particles disperse upon entering  
115 the piping/sewer and remain in the sewer for extended periods of time rather than being removed



116 by plug flow (Manor et al., 2014). Samples were stored on ice and travel time to WEST was 30  
117 minutes or less from the dorms. Wastewater processing and analysis for SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
118 followed procedures previously described (Betancourt et al., 2021). Samples were tested for the  
119 virus using the United States (U.S.) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) RT-PCR  
120 assays that target regions of the nCoV nucleocapsid gene (N1 and N2; Table S1) (Research use  
121 only kit, Integrated DNA Technologies, Coralville, IA). Real-time PCR for the simultaneous  
122 detection of N1 and N2 genes was performed on a LightCycler 480 Instrument II (Roche  
123 Diagnostics) with the LightCycler® Multiplex RNA Virus Master (Roche Diagnostics) (Table  
124 S2).

### 125 *2.3. Clinical Testing Data*

126 Positive detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA (via N1 and N2 gene regions) in wastewater  
127 was utilized as a leading indicator of the presence of SARS-CoV-2 infections within the dorm  
128 communities. Results were immediately communicated to the UA Task Force and Campus Re-  
129 Entry Working Groups, which planned and conducted clinical testing of residents as a response  
130 action(s), as previously described (Betancourt et al., 2021).

131 Clinical tests for COVID-19 diagnosis were performed by antigen testing via nasal swab  
132 samples and RT-PCR via nasopharyngeal swab samples (Betancourt et al., 2021). The analytical  
133 performance characteristics for the antigen test were 96% sensitivity and 100% specificity, as  
134 provided by the manufacturer (Sofia SARS Antigen FIA, Quidel, San Diego, CA, USA).  
135 Performance of the RT-PCR tests were determined by the University of Arizona Genetics Core  
136 for Clinical Services (CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel) with a limit of detection at  
137 150 viral copies/reaction, or 30 viral copies/μl of sample.

138 Clinical testing data was obtained from the University Campus Health Services (CHS)  
139 and the Test All Test Smart (TATS) program. Symptomatic and asymptomatic cases in the study  
140 were tracked based on location and program where clinical tests were conducted. Individuals  
141 with COVID-19 symptoms who sought clinical testing were tested through CHS. Clinical testing  
142 of non-self-reporting (i.e., asymptomatic and sub-clinical) students and employees was  
143 conducted through the TATS program that runs several testing locations on campus and  
144 mobilizes pop-up sites as needed (i.e., targeted clinical testing at dorms with positive wastewater  
145 detection of SARS-CoV-2). A negative antigen test at CHS, where patients were exhibiting  
146 symptoms, was followed by PCR testing to confirm results; data was de-duplicated in situations  
147 when both testing methods were used to confirm test results (Betancourt et al., 2021). To ensure  
148 compliance with the Human Subjects Protection Program (HSPP), the use of clinical data was  
149 reviewed and approved by a UArizona Institutional Review Board (IRB).

#### 150 *2.4. Alignment of wastewater and clinical data*

151 To estimate the number of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals who contributed to a single  
152 positive wastewater sample, a 6-day range of clinical data was considered. Positive clinical cases  
153 from the day before, day-of, and four days after sampling were included in the count of infected  
154 individuals contributing to viral shedding. The rationale for this approach is:

155 1) Residual virus—shed from individuals testing positive for COVID-19 the day prior to  
156 sampling—may be detected in wastewater the following day. Previous sampling indicates that  
157 virus can persist for extended periods of time and be detected even when an estimated 1000  
158 gallons of wastewater has continued to flow through a sewer system (Betancourt et al., 2021).

159 2) Individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 may shed virus into wastewater prior to  
160 showing symptoms and/or being identified as a clinical case. The viral load of SARS-CoV-2

161 appears to peak in infected persons within the first week of infection (Cevik et al., 2020) and the  
162 median incubation period for COVID-19 is estimated to be approximately five days (Lauer et al.,  
163 2020).

164 Following a positive wastewater sample, clinical testing was performed on nearly all  
165 residents living in the dorm via the TATS program (Betancourt et al., 2021). Individuals that  
166 tested positive were removed from the dorm and transferred into isolation. However, some  
167 individuals in the early stages of infection may have tested negative on the day of wastewater  
168 testing, but tested positive after reaching peak viral load of SARS-CoV-2 a few days later. It is  
169 possible that these individuals were shedding virus in feces even though they tested negative via  
170 initial TATS conducted within 24 hours of a positive wastewater signal. Additionally, the full  
171 dorm community was not always available on the first day of targeted testing and were tested a  
172 day or more after a positive wastewater detection. Therefore, clinical data for 4-days following  
173 positive wastewater samples was included in the count of infected individuals since these  
174 persons likely shed and contributed virus to the wastewater samples for several days.

175 The majority (68 out of 81) of positive wastewater samples were associated with new  
176 reported cases of infections within this 6-day period.

### 177 *2.5. Viral Shedding Rate Estimation*

178 The fecal shedding rate of SARS-CoV-2 RNA per gram of feces from an infected  
179 individual was enumerated based on known concentrations of viral RNA in positive wastewater  
180 samples and the fact that the total numbers of infected persons contributing to the total virus load  
181 in the samples were also known. Equations from previous reports using viral loads in wastewater  
182 to estimate the number of infected persons in a community (Ahmed et al., 2020; Chavarria-Miró  
183 et al., 2021; Curtis et al., 2020) were modified so that the fecal shedding rate of viral RNA per

184 infected person could be quantified. The fecal shedding rate (FS) in terms of genome copies per  
185 gram-feces (gc/g-feces) was calculated as follows:

186 (Eq. 1) 
$$FS = \frac{VC * Q * f * h}{G * I}$$

187 where VC is the virus concentration (genome copies/L) in the wastewater sample,  $Q$  is the flow  
188 rate (gpm) of wastewater in the sewer manhole at time of sample collection,  $f$  is the conversion  
189 factor between gallons and liters,  $h$  is the conversion factor between minutes and days,  $G$  is the  
190 typical mass of stool produced per person per day (Curtis et al., 2020; Rose et al., 2015), and  $I$  is  
191 total number of infected persons contributing to the wastewater sample based on the 6-day range  
192 for clinical data (see Section 2.5). Confidence intervals were calculated based on the standard  
193 deviations between sample calculations.

194 Fecal shedding rates based on N1 and N2 genes were calculated independently.

## 195 2.6. Statistical Analysis

196 Statistical analyses were performed in Microsoft Excel (version 16.47.1, 2021) and R  
197 studio (R Studio Team (2020). RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston,  
198 MA. <http://www.rstudio.com/>). Multiple imputation for measurement error (MIME) was  
199 performed to estimate flow rates for missing data when the flow probe was unavailable, as  
200 previously described with modifications (Canales et al., 2018).

## 201 3. Results

### 202 3.1. Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Clinical COVID-19 Cases

203 Asymptomatic and symptomatic cases of COVID-19 were differentiated based on clinical  
204 testing program – TATS for asymptomatic and CHS for symptomatic (see Section 2.4). For all  
205 dates in the study period, a total of 711 clinical cases were reported among the 13 unique dorms.  
206 Clinical data was combined for dorms with converged sewage systems (Dorm E-F and Dorm H-

207 I). Across all dorms, 148 symptomatic cases and 563 asymptomatic cases were reported; thus,  
208 79.2% of SARS-CoV-2 infections were asymptomatic and only 20.8% were symptomatic (Table  
209 2).

210 Examining specific dorm communities, reported clinical cases ranged from zero in Dorm  
211 L to 171 in Dorm D (Table 2). Dorms G and M had the fewest reported infections, as well as the  
212 highest and lowest asymptomatic rates. With limited data (two infections in Dorm G and five  
213 infections in Dorm M), the asymptomatic rate was calculated as 100% for Dorm G and 20% for  
214 Dorm M. Combined Dorm E & F was the only dorm to report equal number of symptomatic and  
215 asymptomatic cases (Table 2). Seven of the eleven monitored communities had asymptomatic  
216 rates between 70 – 85% (Table 2). Two dorms (E & F and M) had asymptomatic rates at 50% or  
217 below, while Dorm G was the only to report 100% of new cases as asymptomatic (Table 2).

### 218 *3.2. Virus Fecal Shedding Estimation*

219 In total, 81 samples in the study period were positive for SARS-CoV-2 N1 and/or N2  
220 gene(s) and 238 samples resulted in no detection of the virus (Table S3). Clinical and wastewater  
221 data were aggregated (see Section 2.5) to calculate the N1 and N2 viral shedding rate per  
222 infected person (see Section 2.6). Only 13 positive wastewater samples were omitted from viral  
223 shedding calculations due to zero reported cases of infection within the 6-day range for clinical  
224 data (Table S3). Negative wastewater samples were not included in viral shedding estimations  
225 due to no detection of SARS-CoV-2 N1/N2 genes. Also, negative samples did not trigger a  
226 response action to conduct clinical testing on residents; thus, there is limited clinical data for the  
227 days that wastewater was negative. Overall, 68 total positive wastewater samples were aligned  
228 with clinical data to extrapolate the fecal shedding rates of SARS-CoV-2 N1 and/or N2 genes.

229           The average N1 shedding rate per infected person was calculated to be  $6.84 \pm 0.77 \log_{10}$   
230 gc/g-feces, considering all positive wastewater samples (n=60) across all dorms (Table 3). The  
231 median was  $6.65 \log_{10}$  gc/g-feces with a full range 5.74 -  $9.76 \log_{10}$  gc/g-feces (Table 3). Within  
232 specific defined communities, Dorm C had the highest average N1 shedding rate at  $7.26 \pm 0.14$   
233 (n=2), while Dorm A had the lowest average at  $6.45 \pm 0.60 \log_{10}$  gc/g-feces (n=13). The widest  
234 range of N1 shedding rates was found in Dorm J with a minimum at 5.98 and a maximum at 9.76  
235  $\log_{10}$  gc/g-feces.

236           The average N2 shedding rate per infected person was calculated to be  $7.74 \pm 0.53 \log_{10}$   
237 gc/g-feces across all positive wastewater samples (n=32) from all dorms (Table 3). The median  
238 was 7.60 with a full range from 6.74 –  $8.60 \log_{10}$  gc/g-feces (Table 3). For specific communities,  
239 combined Dorm H & I had the highest average N2 shedding rate at  $8.21 \pm 0.55$  (n=2), while  
240 Dorm A had the lowest average at  $7.21 \pm 0.35$  (n=5)  $\log_{10}$  gc/g-feces. The widest range of N2  
241 shedding rates was found in Dorm K with a minimum at 7.32 and a maximum at  $8.28 \log_{10}$  gc/g-  
242 feces.

243           With just one positive wastewater sample (n=1) each, Dorms C and D had the lowest  
244 number of estimates for N2 viral shedding rates (Table 3). For Dorm D, the N1 shedding rate  
245 could not be calculated due to zero wastewater samples being positive (i.e., non-detect) for the  
246 N1 gene target (Table S3D). Although Dorm D ( $8.35 \log_{10}$  gc/g-feces) reported a higher N2  
247 shedding rate than Dorm H & I ( $8.21 \log_{10}$  gc/g-feces), it was not reported as a higher average  
248 due to only a single sample (n=1). Combined Dorm E & F also had a low number of samples  
249 with positive detection for N1 (n = 2) and none for N2 (Table 3; Table S3E); thus, the shedding  
250 rate for this combined dorm community could not be calculated for N2.

## 251 **4. Discussion**

### 252 *4.1 Estimation of Asymptomatic Cases as a Percent of Total Cases*

253           The total number of asymptomatic and symptomatic cases of COVID-19 were discerned  
254 in this study based on clinical testing programs – TATS for asymptomatic and CHS for  
255 symptomatic (see Section 2.4). Of the total 711 cases of COVID-19 that were reported via  
256 positive antigen and/or PCR clinical tests, the vast majority (79.2%) did not self-report and were  
257 therefore considered asymptomatic. We should note that this finding may be overestimated in the  
258 case that mildly symptomatic individuals did not self-report, which would categorize them as  
259 asymptomatic if tested and found positive via TATS. This high rate of asymptomatic cases may  
260 be due to the younger and perhaps healthier population surveyed in this study. However, the  
261 finding suggests that the number of people infected with SARs-CoV-2 in the U.S. may be vastly  
262 underestimated, which could have downstream effects for determining the immune population  
263 and herd immunity thresholds.

### 264 *4.2 Viral Shedding Estimation*

265           Fecal shedding rates of SARS-CoV-2 RNA were estimated from dorm wastewater  
266 samples using a modified equation from previous reports (Ahmed et al., 2020; Chavarria-Miró et  
267 al., 2021; Curtis et al., 2020). This calculation accounts for the number of infected people within  
268 a defined community, the amount of fecal material excreted, the shedding rate of infected  
269 individuals, the flow rate of the wastewater, and the viral load within the wastewater. Of these  
270 parameters, the fecal shedding rate of SARS-CoV-2 from infected individuals is the least known.  
271 Until this research, shedding rate estimations were based upon limited results that indicated a  
272 large variance across a small number of individuals (Wölfel et al., 2020). Shedding rates were  
273 further extrapolated from the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of this limited dataset and used to calculate the

274 number of infected persons contributing to viral loads in wastewater (Ahmed et al., 2020;  
275 Chavarria-Miró et al., 2021; Curtis et al., 2020). However, models and predictions based on these  
276 percentile shedding rates are likely to be inaccurate without pairing wastewater results with  
277 clinical data.

278 In this current study, wastewater from student dorms with known defined communities  
279 was sampled and assayed for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Wastewater samples that tested positive for  
280 viral RNA triggered targeted clinical testing of almost all residents within the specific dorm.  
281 Consequently, fecal shedding rates could be calculated since virus wastewater concentrations and  
282 the corresponding numbers of infected dorm residents were both known. These shedding rate  
283 estimations are reasonable since each dorm was a theoretically closed population, where  
284 nonresidents were prohibited from entering dorms, and individuals who were identified as  
285 positive were isolated within other facilities. This also prevented recounting of positive  
286 individuals and additional shedding on days subsequent to being counted as an infected  
287 individual, since persistent shedding occurs over multiple days (Cevik et al., 2020; Gupta et al.,  
288 2020). Therefore, the shedding rates calculated from the dorms represent incident infections  
289 only.

290 For estimating the number of individuals shedding and contributing to the viral load in  
291 wastewater samples, a 6-day range of clinical data was considered (See Section 2.5). Then, fecal  
292 shedding rates of SARS-CoV-2 RNA were extrapolated from wastewater viral loads in samples  
293 specific to UArizona dorms in which the exact number of infected persons was known. This  
294 estimation is based on a calculation that accounts for the number of infected persons within a  
295 defined community; the amount of fecal material excreted per person; the fecal shedding rate of



296 viral RNA from infected individuals; the flow rate of the wastewater and the viral load within the  
297 wastewater (See Section 2.6).

298         The aggregation of wastewater and clinical data enabled quantification of SARS-CoV-2  
299 fecal shedding rates per infected person. Mean shedding rates averaged over all dorms with  
300 positive wastewaters were  $6.84 \pm 0.77 \log_{10} \text{ gc/g-feces}$  based on the N1 gene and  $7.74 \pm 0.53$   
301  $\log_{10} \text{ gc/g-feces}$  based on the N2 gene (Table 3). Statistical parameters included in Table 3  
302 include number of samples (N), average values (Avg), standard deviation (Std dev), median  
303 (Med), minimum (Min), and maximum (Max). These statistics are important to establish the  
304 precision of the calculated shedding rates since many factors influence shedding rates. The  
305 calculated rates based on the incidence of both N1 and N2 are fairly consistent with reasonable  
306 calculated standard deviations. It is also important to note that mean rates are based on relatively  
307 large numbers of calculations:  $n = 60$  (N1) and  $n = 32$  (N2). Notably, N2 gene values were  
308 approximately 1-log greater than the N1 gene in feces.

309         While this paper develops population-level shedding rates, individual shedding rates may  
310 vary based on multiple factors such as sex, age, co-morbidities, socioeconomic status, and the  
311 severity of symptoms and duration of infection. The duration of shedding appears to be affected  
312 by the severity of the COVID-19 disease: asymptomatic (6 days) < mild symptoms (10 days) <  
313 moderate symptoms (12 days) < serious (14 days) < critical (32 days) (Chen et al., 2020).  
314 Recent reports also suggest that asymptomatic individuals had a shorter duration of viral  
315 shedding than pre-symptomatic individuals (Hue et al., 2020).

316         Our data assumes early infection shedding rates because those people would be identified  
317 within the 6-day period and removed from the dorm and brought into an isolated living quarter.  
318 However, it is possible that some individuals may have started and/or continued shedding viral

319 RNA in feces outside of the assumed 6-day period. The shedding rate may also be slightly  
320 overestimated based on case capture definitions, as although the vast majority of individuals in  
321 each dorm were tested after positive wastewater sample results, a minority of residents were not  
322 tested. Shedding rates in this study are based on young university students who reside in  
323 dormitories and do not necessarily approximate the general population. Nevertheless, a recent  
324 study estimated the total number of active shedders from SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in  
325 wastewater from a large metropolitan area similarly demonstrating that shedding resulted from a  
326 high proportion of asymptomatic individuals (Chavarria-Miró et al., 2021).

327         Some studies have reported similar initial shedding rates from symptomatic and  
328 asymptomatic infections (Lavezzo et al., 2020; Van Vinh Chau et al., 2020); whereas, other  
329 studies have found lower viral loads in asymptomatic cases (Han et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2020).  
330 Also, some reports indicate that only approximately 50% of COVID-19 patients shed viral RNA  
331 in stool samples (Gupta et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020a), suggesting the possibility that not all  
332 infected individuals shed viral RNA in feces. Regardless of these considerations, viral load in  
333 wastewater in this study were based on all individuals (symptomatic and asymptomatic)  
334 contributing to the sewage system. Therefore, fecal shedding estimates are general for defined  
335 communities of mixed clinical cases, while considering the high proportion of asymptomatic to  
336 symptomatic reported cases.

337         Lastly, it is important to note that no fecal samples were collected from individual  
338 COVID-19 patients directly. Therefore, results in this study are specific to wastewater from  
339 defined communities and is not intended to inform clinical data. Data and results from this study  
340 should be compared with clinical research and evaluations.

341 *4.3 Concluding Remarks*

342           This study may have significant implications for public health. The fecal shedding rate of  
343 SARS-CoV-2 RNA derived in this study can be utilized to estimate the total number of  
344 infections in a community based on wastewater viral concentrations. Knowledge of disease  
345 prevalence, especially as a leading indicator, can be used to assist communities in efficient  
346 resource allocation to prevent and contain COVID-19 outbreaks. This study also provides further  
347 understanding for the total number of cases that are symptomatic versus asymptomatic. Moving  
348 forward, the number of reported cases can provide context for estimating the number of cases  
349 that were asymptomatic and/or unreported. This, in turn, could have implications for  
350 understanding the proportion of individuals that has been exposed to COVID-19 and for  
351 understanding progress towards immunity within a community.

#### 352 **Acknowledgements**

353 The authors thank the UArizona Task Force, Amy Glicker, and Jeff Bliznick for their  
354 contributions. Financial support for the study was provided by the University of Arizona Campus  
355 Re-Entry Task Force. The IRB at the University of Arizona reviewed the study and verified that  
356 all data was de-identified and complied with the Human Subjects Protection.

357

## References

- Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J.W., Choi, P.M., Kitajima, M., Simpson, S.L., Li, J., Tschärke, B., Verhagen, R., Smith, W.J.M., Zaugg, J., Dierens, L., Hugenholtz, P., Thomas, K. V, Mueller, J.F., 2020. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Sci. Total Environ.* 728, 138764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>
- Akgiray, Ö., 2005. Explicit solutions of the Manning equation for partially filled circular pipes. *Can. J. Civ. Eng.* 32, 490–499. <https://doi.org/10.1139/L05-001>
- Betancourt, W.Q., Schmitz, B.W., Innes, G.K., Prasek, S.M., Pogreba Brown, K.M., Stark, E.R., Foster, A.R., Sprissler, R.S., Harris, D.T., Sherchan, S.P., Gerba, C.P., Pepper, I.L., 2021. COVID-19 containment on a college campus via wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical testing and an intervention. *Sci. Total Environ.* 779, 146408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146408>
- Brönimann, S., Rebhan, K., Lemberger, U., Misrai, V., Shariat, S.F., Pradere, B., 2020. Secretion of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 in urine. *Curr. Opin. Urol.* 30, 735–739. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MOU.0000000000000808>
- Canales, R.A., Wilson, A.M., Pearce-Walker, J.I., Verhougstraete, M.P., Reynolds, K.A., 2018. Methods for Handling Left-Censored Data in Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 84. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01203-18>
- Cevik, M., Tate, M., Lloyd, O., Maraolo, A.E., Schafers, J., Ho, A., 2020. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Microbe.* [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(20\)30172-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30172-5)
- Chavarria-Miró, G., Anfruns-Estrada, E., Martínez-Velázquez, A., Vázquez-Portero, M., Guix, S., Paraira, M., Galofré, B., Sánchez, G., Pintó, R.M., Bosch, A., 2021. Time Evolution of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Wastewater during the First Pandemic Wave of COVID-19 in the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona, Spain. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 87, e02750-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02750-20>
- Curtis, K., Keeling, D., Yetka, K., Larson, A., Gonzalez, R., 2020. Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Concentration and Loading Variability from Grab and 24-Hour Composite Samples. *medRxiv* 2020.07.10.20150607. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.10.20150607>
- Gupta, S., Parker, J., Smits, S., Underwood, J., Dolwani, S., 2020. Persistent viral shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces - a rapid review. *Color. Dis. Off. J. Assoc. Coloproctology Gt. Britain Irel.* 22, 611–620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.15138>
- Han, M.S., Seong, M.-W., Kim, N., Shin, S., Cho, S.I., Park, H., Kim, T.S., Park, S.S., Choi, E.H., 2020. Viral RNA Load in Mildly Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Children with COVID-19, Seoul, South Korea. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2610.202449>
- Lauer, S.A., Grantz, K.H., Bi, Q., Jones, F.K., Zheng, Q., Meredith, H.R., Azman, A.S., Reich, N.G., Lessler, J., 2020. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 172, 577–582. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-0504>

- Lavezzo, E., Franchin, E., Ciavarella, C., Cuomo-Dannenburg, G., Barzon, L., Del Vecchio, C., Rossi, L., Manganelli, R., Loregian, A., Navarin, N., Abate, D., Sciro, M., Merigliano, S., De Canale, E., Vanuzzo, M.C., Besutti, V., Saluzzo, F., Onelia, F., Pacenti, M., Parisi, S.G., Carretta, G., Donato, D., Flor, L., Cocchio, S., Masi, G., Sperduti, A., Cattarino, L., Salvador, R., Nicoletti, M., Caldart, F., Castelli, G., Nieddu, E., Labella, B., Fava, L., Drigo, M., Gaythorpe, K.A.M., Brazzale, A.R., Toppo, S., Trevisan, M., Baldo, V., Donnelly, C.A., Ferguson, N.M., Dorigatti, I., Crisanti, A., Ainslie, K.E.C., Baguelin, M., Bhatt, S., Boonyasiri, A., Boyd, O., Cattarino, L., Ciavarella, C., Coupland, H.L., Cucunubá, Z., Cuomo-Dannenburg, G., Djafaara, B.A., Donnelly, C.A., Dorigatti, I., van Elsland, S.L., FitzJohn, R., Flaxman, S., Gaythorpe, K.A.M., Green, W.D., Hallett, T., Hamlet, A., Haw, D., Imai, N., Jeffrey, B., Knock, E., Laydon, D.J., Mellan, T., Mishra, S., Nedjati-Gilani, G., Nouvellet, P., Okell, L.C., Parag, K. V., Riley, S., Thompson, H.A., Unwin, H.J.T., Verity, R., Vollmer, M.A.C., Walker, P.G.T., Walters, C.E., Wang, H., Wang, Y., Watson, O.J., Whittaker, C., Whittles, L.K., Xi, X., Ferguson, N.M., Team, I.C.C.-19 R., 2020. Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the Italian municipality of Vo'. *Nature* 584, 425–429. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2488-1>
- Medema, G., Been, F., Heijnen, L., Pettersen, S., 2020a. Implementation of environmental surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 virus to support public health decisions: Opportunities and challenges. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Heal.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.006>
- Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., Brouwer, A., 2020b. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in the Netherlands. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357>
- Morone, G., Palomba, A., Iosa, M., Caporaso, T., De Angelis, D., Venturiero, V., Savo, A., Coiro, P., Carbone, D., Gimigliano, F., Iolascon, G., Paolucci, S., 2020. Incidence and Persistence of Viral Shedding in COVID-19 Post-acute Patients With Negativized Pharyngeal Swab: A Systematic Review. *Front. Med.* 7, 562. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2020.00562>
- Peccia, J., Zulli, A., Brackney, D.E., Grubaugh, N.D., Kaplan, E.H., Casanovas-Massana, A., Ko, A.I., Malik, A.A., Wang, D., Wang, M., Warren, J.L., Weinberger, D.M., Arnold, W., Omer, S.B., 2020. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 38, 1164–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z>
- Rose, C., Parker, A., Jefferson, B., Cartmell, E., 2015. The Characterization of Feces and Urine: A Review of the Literature to Inform Advanced Treatment Technology. *Crit. Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol.* 45, 1827–1879. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10643389.2014.1000761>
- Sun, J., Zhu, A., Li, H., Zheng, K., Zhuang, Z., Chen, Z., Shi, Y., Zhang, Z., Chen, S.-B., Liu, X., Dai, J., Li, X., Huang, S., Huang, X., Luo, L., Wen, L., Zhuo, J., Li, Y., Wang, Y., Zhang, L., Zhang, Y., Li, F., Feng, L., Chen, X., Zhong, N., Yang, Z., Huang, J., Zhao, J., Li, Y.-M., 2020. Isolation of infectious SARS-CoV-2 from urine of a COVID-19 patient. *Emerg. Microbes Infect.* <https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1760144>
- Van Vinh Chau, N., Lam, V.T., Dung, Nguyen Thanh, Yen, L.M., Minh, N.N.Q., Hung, L.M., Ngoc, N.M., Dung, Nguyen Tri, Man, D.N.H., Nguyet, L.A., Nhat, L.T.H., Nhu, L.N.T., Ny, N.T.H., Hong, N.T.T., Kestelyn, E., Dung, N.T.P., Xuan, T.C., Hien, T.T., Phong, N.T., Tu, T.N.H., Geskus, R.B., Thanh, T.T., Truong, N.T., Binh, N.T., Thuong, T.C., Thwaites, G., Van Tan, L., 2020. The Natural History and Transmission Potential of Asymptomatic

- Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* an Off. Publ. Infect. Dis. Soc. Am. 71, 2679–2687. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa711>
- Wang, W., Xu, Y., Gao, R., Lu, R., Han, K., Wu, G., Tan, W., 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA* 323, 1843–1844. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3786>
- Wölfel, R., Corman, V.M., Guggemos, W., Seilmaier, M., Zange, S., Müller, M.A., Niemeyer, D., Jones, T.C., Vollmar, P., Rothe, C., Hoelscher, M., Bleicker, T., Brünink, S., Schneider, J., Ehmann, R., Zwirgmaier, K., Drosten, C., Wendtner, C., 2020. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 581, 465–469. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x>
- Xiao, F., Sun, J., Xu, Y., Li, F., Huang, X., Li, H., Zhao, Jingxian, Huang, J., Zhao, Jincun, 2020. Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in Feces of Patient with Severe COVID-19. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 26, 1920–1922. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2608.200681>
- Zhang, Y., Chen, C., Zhu, S., Shu, C., Wang, D., Song, J., Song, Y., Zhen, W., Feng, Z., Wu, G., Xu, J., Xu, W., n.d. Isolation of 2019-nCoV from a Stool Specimen of a Laboratory-Confirmed Case of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *China CDC Wkly.* 2, 123–124. <https://doi.org/10.46234/ccdcw2020.033>
- Zhou, R., Li, F., Chen, F., Liu, H., Zheng, J., Lei, C., Wu, X., 2020. Viral dynamics in asymptomatic patients with COVID-19. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* 96, 288–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.030>

Table 1: Meta-data for student dormitories.

<b>Fall 2020</b>					
<b>Dorm</b>	<b>Occupancy<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Room Type</b>	<b>Bathrooms</b>	
A	611	722	Single, Double	Community, All-Gender	
B	342	400	Single, Double	Community	
C	123	181	Single, Double, Triple <sup>b</sup> Single, Double, Suite-	Community	
D	623	731	Style	Suite	
E	206	300	Single, Double	Community, All-Gender	
F	56	60	Single	Community	
G	231	300	Apartments	In-Room (1 per bedroom)	
H	195	238	Single, Double	Community, All-Gender	
I	181	238	Single, Double	Community, All-Gender	
J	424	482	Single, Double	Community	
K	328	369	Double	Community, All-Gender	
L	76	106	Single, Double, Triple <sup>b</sup>	Community, Sink-in-Room	
M	132	152	Single, Double	Community	

<sup>a</sup> Occupancy varied throughout the Fall 2020 semester, so the highest numbers of residents at any given time throughout the semester are shown.

<sup>b</sup> Due to the pandemic, UArizona limited rooms to a maximum of two occupants. No triple-occupant rooms were offered during the time of this analysis.

Table 2: Clinical positives for COVID-19 in wastewater-monitored dorms, 8/17/20-11/20/20

Dorm	Clinical Positives	Symptomatic (CHS)		Asymptomatic (TATS) <sup>a</sup>	
		Total	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Total	Percent <sup>b</sup>
A	164	35	21.3%	129	78.7%
B	92	16	17.4%	76	82.6%
C	10	3	30.0%	7	70.0%
D	171	34	19.9%	137	80.1%
E & F	16	8	50.0%	8	50.0%
G	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
H & I	74	17	23.0%	57	77.0%
J	111	16	14.4%	95	85.6%
K	66	15	22.7%	51	77.3%
L	0	0	-	0	-
M	5	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
Total	711	148	20.8%	563	79.2%

<sup>a</sup> Asymptomatic cases may also include mildly symptomatic individuals that did not self-report.

<sup>b</sup> Percent of total new clinical positive cases of infection.



Table 3: SARS-CoV-2 Viral Shedding Per Infected Person Extrapolated from UArizona Dorm WBE

Dorm	N1						N2					
	Avg.	Stdev	Med.	Min.	Max.	n	Avg.	Stdev	Med.	Min.	Max.	n
A	6.45	0.60	6.36	5.78	7.66	13	7.21	0.35	7.33	6.74	7.52	5
B	6.99	0.49	7.21	6.21	7.40	5	7.51	0.33	7.51	7.27	7.74	2
C	7.26	0.14	7.26	7.16	7.35	2	8.05	-	-	-	-	1
D <sup>a</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.35	-	-	-	-	1
E & F <sup>b</sup>	6.65	0.12	6.65	6.57	6.73	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
H & I	6.74	0.68	6.65	5.74	7.71	12	8.21	0.55	8.21	7.82	8.60	2
J	6.99	0.96	6.78	5.98	9.76	14	7.43	0.29	7.54	7.01	7.93	10
K	7.08	0.89	6.68	5.80	8.28	12	8.13	0.46	8.28	7.32	8.59	11
Total	6.84	0.77	6.65	5.74	9.76	60	7.74	0.53	7.60	6.74	8.60	32

All values are presented in  $\log_{10}$  genome copies per gram of feces ( $\log_{10}$  gc/g-feces), except for n (number of samples). Avg., average;

Stdev, standard deviation; Med., median; Min., minimum; Max., maximum; n, number of samples. (-), no data.

<sup>a</sup> N1 shedding rate could not be calculated from Dorm D due to no positive wastewater sample corroborating with a new reported case(s) of infection or clinical positive test.

<sup>b</sup> N2 shedding rate could not be calculated from Dorm E & F due to no positive wastewater sample corroborating with a new reported case(s) of infection or clinical positive test.